

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 \* \* \*

4 NEWMARK GROUP, INC., G&E  
5 ACQUISITION COMPANY, LLC and BGC  
REAL ESTATE OF NEVADA, LLC

Case No. 2:15-cv-00531-RFB-EJY

6 Plaintiff,

**ORDER**

7 v.

8 AVISON YOUNG (CANADA) INC.;  
9 AVISON YOUNG (USA) INC.; AVISON  
YOUNG-NEVADA, LLC, MARK ROSE,  
10 THE NEVADA COMMERCIAL GROUP,  
JOHN PINJUV, and JOSEPH KUPIEC; DOES  
11 1 through 5; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES  
6 through 10,

12 Defendants.  
13

14 Before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Exhibits Under Seal. ECF No.  
15 258. Also before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of Motion for  
16 Leave to Amend Third Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order and Certain Exhibits, Under  
17 Seal. ECF No. 265. No opposition to either of these Motions was filed.

18 A party seeking to seal a judicial record must meet its burden of overcoming the strong  
19 presumption in favor of access and public policies favoring disclosure. *Kamakana v. City and Cnty.*  
20 *of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that those who seek to maintain the  
21 secrecy of documents attached to dispositive motions must meet the high threshold of showing that  
22 “compelling reasons” support secrecy). “Many courts have applied the compelling reasons standard  
23 to . . . temporary restraining orders.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092,  
24 1096 n.2 (9th Cir. 2016) (collecting cases); *see also Selling Source, LLC v. Red River Ventures, LLC*,  
25 No. 2:09-cv-01491-JCM-GWF, 2011 WL 1630338, at \*5 (finding requests for preliminary  
26 injunctive relief should be treated as dispositive motions for purposes of sealing court records) (D.  
27 Nev. Apr. 29, 2011). The mere fact that the production of records may lead to a party's  
28 embarrassment, incrimination, or exposure to further litigation will not alone compel the court to

1 seal its records. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1136 (9th Cir.  
2 2003). Compelling reasons require a demonstration of something more, such as when court files  
3 have become a vehicle for improper purposes, including use of records to gratify private spite,  
4 promote public scandal, disseminate libelous statements, or circulate trade secrets. *Nixon v. Warner*  
5 *Commc'ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978).

6 The Court has considered both Motions to Seal (ECF Nos. 258 and 265) and finds as follows.

7 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Leave to File Exhibits Under Seal  
8 (ECF No. 258) is GRANTED and Exhibits 1, 2, and 13 to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs'  
9 Motion for Leave to Amend Third Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order, ECF No. 256  
10 shall remain sealed.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File Reply in Support of  
12 Motion for Leave to Amend Third Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order and Certain  
13 Exhibits Under Seal (ECF No. 265) is GRANTED and Exhibits 3 through 10, 23, and 24 to Plaintiffs'  
14 Reply in Support of Motion for Leave to Amend Third Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling  
15 Order, ECF 255, shall remain sealed.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the unredacted version of Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of  
17 Motion for Leave to Amend Third Amended Discovery Plan and Scheduling Order shall remain  
18 sealed.

19 DATED: March 20, 2020

20  
21   
22 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28